R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 020 074 RE 001 197

THE FINAL REPORT OF THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN READING FOR TEAMS OF PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS, GRADES 7-12, CONDUCTED AT NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY.

BY- WILLIAMS, RICHARD P.
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIV., LAS CRUCES,BUR. EDUC. RES.

REPORT NUMBER PUB-9 PUB DATE OCT 67
CONTRACT OEC-4-7-490314-2265
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$2.32 56P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *INSERVICE PROGRAMS, *SUMMER INSTITUTES, *READING INSTRUCTION, *SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS,

THIS REPORT PRESENTS AN EVALUATION OF THE 8-WEEK NDEA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN READING AT NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY, SUMMER OF 1967, BY THE 27 PARTICIPANTS AND THE DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE. READING SPECIALISTS FROM ACROSS THE NATION SERVED AS CONSULTANTS. ADMINISTRATORS, SUPERVISORS, AND TEACHERS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL READING WHO HAD NOT TAKEN MORE THAN ONE GRADUATE COURSE IN THE TEACHING OF SECONDARY READING PARTICIPATED IN THE INSTITUTE AND WERE CONCERNED WITH THE INSTITUTE'S OBJECTIVES, ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION, AND INSTRUCTION AND STAFF. THE SUCCESS OF THE INSTITUTE IS ATTRIBUTED TO THE SUFFICIENT TIME PROVIDED FOR PREPLANNING, THE CAREFUL SELECTION OF CONSULTANTS AND PARTICIPANTS, THE USE OF A VARIETY OF ACTIVITIES AND LEARNING EXPERIENCES, THE AVAILABILITY OF MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT, AND THE FLEXIBILITY OF THE DAILY SCHEDULE. EXAMPLES OF THE EVALUATION FORMS USED AND APPENDIXES ARE INCLUDED. (NS)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED020074

THE FINAL REPORT
OF THE
NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT
INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
IN
READING FOR TEAMS OF
PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS
GRADES 7 - 12

CONTRACT NO. OEC-4-7-490314-2265

DR. RICHARD P. WILLIAMS, DIRECTOR

PUBLICATION NUMBER 9

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
LAS CRUCES, NEW MEXICO

RE001 197

THE FINAL REPORT
OF THE
INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
IN
READING FOR TEAMS OF
PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS
GRADES 7 - 12
CONDUCTED AT
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY

CONTRACT NUMBER: OEC-4-7-490314-2265

DR. RICHARD P. WILLIAMS, DIRECTOR

PUBLICATION NUMBER 9

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
LAS CRUCES, NEW MEXICO

PREPARED AT THE
RESEARCH CENTER
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY

OCTOBER 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
II.	INTRODUCTION	1
III.	SPECIAL REPORT	2
IV.	EVALUATION	
	Relations with the USOE in All Programs and Fiscal Matters	5
	Relationships with Your Own Administration	6
	Pre-Institute Preparation; Problems and Solutions	6
	Orientation of Participants	7
	Physical Facilities	8
	Field Trips and Practicum Effectiveness in Terms of Number and Purpose	8
	Participant Communication with Director and Staff During the Institute	9
	Full-time versus Part-time Staff	10
	Regular Faculty of Your Institute versus Visiting Faculty	10
	All Other Part-time Lecturers and Consultants	11
	Unique Factors of the Institute	11
	Use of New Materials	12
	What Do the Enrollees Say was the Most Significant Thing that Happened to Them During the Institute?	14
	What Do You Think?	14
	What Do Enrollees Say They will do Differently as a Result of the Institute When They Return to their Schools in September?	14
	What Do You Think?	15
	Did You Make Any Arrangements for a Follow-up, and If So, What Are They?	15
	Major Strengths of the Institute	16
	Major Weaknesses	17
	Major Problems Encountered and Your Solutions	18
	What Is Your Evaluation of Each of the Following Aspects of Your Institute and What Would You Change If You Were to Direct Another Institute?	18
	Potential Impact of the Institute on the Regular Academic Year's Program of Your Institution	21
V.	APPENDIX	
	1. Name and Home Address of Participants	23
	2. Pre-institute School Addresses of Participants	24
	3. Post-institute School Addresses of Participants	25
	4. Institute Evaluation by Participants	26
	5. Follow-up Evaluation by Participants	32
	6. Newsletters to Participants	36

I. Acknowledgments

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to:

the department of elementary and secondary education and to the Reading Research Center at New Mexico State University for providing released time to the project director which enabled him to design and to conduct this project

the U S Department of Health, Education and Welfare and Dr. Donald Bigelow who authorized the project under Title XI of the NDEA; and to the members of Dr. Bigelow's staff, especially Dr. Doris V. Gunderson.

Dr. Donald Roush, Dean of the College of Education and Dr. Verna Vickery, Director of the Reading Research Center for their continuous encouragement, and to Dr. James Weiss, Mrs. Betty Stevenson and the staff of the New Mexico State University Research Center for their most helpful assistance in the administration of the project.

the competant instructional staff of the Institute for their contributions of excellence in teaching and to the graduate assistants for their continuous efforts to help ensure the success of the Institute.

the Las Cruces Public Schools which provided children for the practicum phase of the Institute.

to Mrs. Nelda Charles the Institute secretary who cheerfully carried out many tasks which at the time seemed impossible.

The writer has been rewarded by:

the twenty-seven participants who were dedicated enough to complete the rigorous schedule of work to improve the teaching of reading at the secondary level.

the many individuals who extended a spirit of cooperation to help meet the specific need caused by a shortage of qualified secondary reading personnel in the Southwest.

II. INTRODUCTION

The Final Technical Report for the NDEA Institute for Advanced Study in Reading at New Mexico State University is submitted by the director, Dr. Richard P. Williams, to the United States Office of Education, in accordance with the Title XI Handbook for Directors, Summer, 1967. The author of this report encountered difficulty in the construction of this document in describing fully the many valuable facets of the eight-week Institute. He agrees with many writers that the two dimensions of the printed page will not contain the many-pronged concepts unfolding in the many excellent experiences we encountered during our Institute. The author has attempted in this limited fashion to report the activities of the professional staff and Institute participants that were involved as a result of a contractual arrangement between the United States Office of Education and New Mexico State University.

III. SPECIAL REPORT

The director and staff employed in the NDEA Institute for Advanced Study in Reading during the summer, 1967, at New Mexico State University, were in agreement concerning the excellent concept that the NDEA Institute proposed of meeting an educational problem with team forces. Many teams were developed to meet the specific problem of a shortage of secondary reading personnel and a lack of secondary reading programs in the Southwest. Reading specialists from across the United States formed a highly skilled team to meet the problem, local school people organized teams representing administration and teaching staff to focus their attention on the problem, and the United States Office of Education teamed with New Mexico State University to provide a financial basis and academic plan of operation.

The director felt one of the major factors of the success of the Institute was the pre-planning period. The allotted time permitted not only the crystallization of a unique program, but the sophistication of these program ideas into a sound psychological package for learning. The Institute Director's Conference in Washington was a profitable time for receiving and sharing ideas with fellow directors. The one-week Institute in Special Media provided the director with additional time for receiving and sharing of ideas for an effective program.

The director is now confident that nothing will take the place of a highly qualified professional staff and would be pleased to conduct another institute if he could be assured of having the highly qualified professional staff to insure the same results that were gained during this Institute. The attitude of the staff and the participants was exceptionally positive during

total duration of the Institute.

Flexibility within the daily program to meet the individual and group needs of the participants provided an excellent structure for learning. Formal instruction was provided by one or more instructors in groups of various sizes. Daily evaluation and staff planning, using the Institute's objectives as guidelines, permitted development of both individual and group proficiency of participants. In planning, each activity's contribution toward the objectives of the Institute was considered. At the conclusion of three weeks, an examination was administered to the participants to discern their academic progress. A comparison of this examination to an examination administered the summer before to a group of graduate students enrolled in an eight hour block of reading courses was made. The Institute participants demonstrated greater sophistication concerning their knowledge of reading and ability to generalize this knowledge with only three weeks' training than the normal university block accomplished in a total of eight weeks.

The availability of children for a tutorial program to experiment with new materials and equipment is necessary to learn effectively how to teach children to read.

The team project provided opportunity for administrators and teachers to work together and record their ideas for expansion of a developmental reading program into the secondary level. Communication between participants and staff members provided opportunities to make small changes before problems could become major. Once again the team concept was part of the communications. Participants were not always concerned with what was best for themselves but what was best for the team (democracy in action).

The Institute spirit appeared to be greatly enhanced by scheduled weekly social activities that involved both participants and staff.

Because of physical strain and rigor of an Institute program, it was the opinion of the director and staff to possibly include an age limit of participants in future institutes.

IV. EVALUATION

Relations with the USOE in All Program and Fiscal Matters

The director found his relationship with the United States Office of Education most satisfactory. The manual for the preparation of proposals appeared clear and direct concerning the Title XI projects. The Handbook for Directors was a very valuable tool in the execution of institute project. When consultation was needed, Dr. Doris V. Gunderson and her assistant, Mrs. O'Leary, were readily available with appropriate guidance and suggestions. The director of this Institute's personal concept of the USOE changed considerably during his attendance at the Directors' Conference in Washington. He found the USOE staff were genuinely interested in local education problems as well as national problems and endeavoring to do what they could to resolve the problems at both levels.

The Institute director was pleased to have Dr. Richard J. Riordan, Specialist, Counseling and Guidance from USOE, visit his Institute while on campus with the Guidance and Counseling Institute. Dr. Riordan's visit was appropriate and enlightened the participants about the Office of Education's responsibilities and new legislation.

If all relationships between project directors and administration were at the high professional level as the one between Dr. Gunderson's office and the Institute director at New Mexico State University, all projects would be executed in an efficient and pleasant manner.

Relationships with Your Own Administration

The director felt New Mexico State University lent its support to the Institute in Reading, from the Academic Vice President on down. The Research Center offered its services and facilities in a most efficient manner. The Graduate Office and Registrar's Office were very cooperative in a pre-registration plan which kept Institute participants from standing in lines. The College Dean, Dr. Donald Roush, demonstrated a continuous enthusiastic support of the Institute approach for training teachers. The Director of the Reading Research Center, Dr. Verna Vickery, made available the Center's facilities to the Institute, along with her enthusiastic encouragement when most needed. Other university agencies which were very helpful to the director and the success of the Institute included Library staff, Student Housing, Student Food Services, University Bookstore personnel, staff at the Audio-Visual Center, staff of the ERIC Clearinghouse Center, Physical Plant and Maintenance, News Service, and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Pre-Institute Preparations; Problems and Solutions

Under the criteria for selection of teams a problem arose concerning the Institute's Participation Code 3. The Institute plan of operation defined a team as "two or more participants from the same school district, one of the participants must be a principal or supervisor and one participant must be a teacher." The plan of operation also required, "No applicant shall have taken more than one graduate level course in the teaching of reading in the secondary school." We found very few reading supervisors that qualified under Participation Code 3. It appears the public schools that have supervisors have secured supervisors with more than one graduate course in reading.

In our selection of teams we were able to find a sufficient number of principals that were willing to come with their teachers. In future institutes we would consider a change of code for the team member representing administration (supervisor or principal).

Orientation of Participants

Five different Newsletters were mailed to participants between the time our office received their letter of acceptance and the opening of the Institute. (See appendix: Newsletters to Participants). The first morning of the Institute was devoted to orientation to the campus of New Mexico State University. Official greetings were received from Dr. Donald Roush, Dean of the College, Dr. James McComas, Head of the Department, and Dr. Verna Vickery, Director of the Reading Research Center. Other members of the university staff who aided the orientation of the participants included Mrs. Lease, Educational Librarian; Mrs. Williams, Student Housing; Mr. Gillette, Bookstore; and Mrs. Smith, Payroll Office who permitted us to give the participants their first stipend at 8:05 the first morning of the Institute. Two participant committees were formed during the first session to aid the successful functioning of the Institute: 1) a Gripe Committee, and 2) a Social Committee.

Registration materials were completed by the Institute's secretary before the participants arrived on campus. During the orientation period, participants proofread the registration material and the materials were then forwarded to the Registrar's office. There were no lines for standing nor inexperienced help for confusion. Participants reported this to be a positive approach to registration. Rules and regulations governing Institute participants were explained briefly and a small packet was given similar to the

one mailed with one of the Newsletters concerning the university, the community, and places of interest to the participants.

Physical Facilities

The staff was housed in the Teacher Education Building which included an office for the director and secretary and two offices for visiting staff, and study carrels were provided for graduate assistants. Two refrigerated air conditioned classrooms and a seminar room were reserved in the Fine Arts Building for exclusive use of the NDEA Institute. One of the classrooms was used for lecture-type activity and the other classroom served as a materials center workroom which had continuous displays of materials and equipment for participants' browsing, borrowing, or extensive use. With three rooms available, there was adequate space for small group discussion seminars and multiple types of grouping. The music practice studios were available during the practicum portion of the Institute for tutorial work. The small soundproof studio provided an excellent setting for the participants to work with a child on a one-to-one basis.

Field Trips and Practicum Effectiveness in Terms of Number and Purpose

Three field trips were made during the duration of the Institute. The first trip was to Juarez, Chihuahua, Mexico, to visit the Institute of Technology and view their elaborate laboratory for teaching English to Spanish-speaking children. The participants also visited the city market, a glass factory, a fine arts and crafts museum, and had lunch at Virginia's for real Mexican food. The students appeared to gain insights into the Mexican culture, past and present, and make a comparison of their situation in the United States with the situation in Mexico.

The second field trip was to the White Sands Missile Range Headquarters for a tour of the facilities and range, and an excellent presentation using current media facility (it appears the United States Armed Forces are far ahead of public school practice in the use of media).

The third field trip was to view the data retrieval and processing of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools on New Mexico State University campus. The concept of ERIC proved enlightening to the participants.

The tutorial phase of the Institute consisted of two high level meetings per week where each participant met with a secondary student from the Las Cruces Public Schools summer program for an hour. The tutorial phase proved to be valuable to the participants as well as the children by providing an opportunity for the particpants to experimentally administer tests, analyze a reading problem, recommend a solution, and work the solution under the guidance of a reading specialist. Interestingly, all children progressed in a positive manner when a post-test was administered.

Participant Communication with Director and Staff During the Institute

The director and staff had an open-door policy throughout the duration of the Institute for participants' problems. A scheduled morning coffee break provided the director and staff an opportunity to meet with participants on an informal basis. Many valuable comments were received during this time from both staff and participants. Small group counseling aided the communication from staff to participants. Individual consultation periods were scheduled so the director and staff could help meet the needs and give guidance to the participants. Through these meetings 16 of the 27 participants filed for admission to advanced degree programs at New Mexico

State University. Some of the participants were already admitted to a degree program at New Mexico State University and other universities.

Full-time versus Part-time Staff

Full-time staff members are definitely needed to cause continuity and vector, however the part-time staff added color and flavor. The participants reported their pleasure in being able to meet and react to the many staff members the Institute employed. In future institutes I would suggest at least two full-time members besides the director be employed to give consistency and vector, and the additional staff be part-time instructors for lectures. We were very pleased with the high level performance of the full-time instructors and the part-time instructors.

Regular Faculty of Your Institution versus Visiting Faculty

New Mexico State University employs three professors who work solely in the area of reading. If more than one faculty member of our campus is employed in an institute, the current reading program falls apart in the summer. Located in the Land of Sand and Sage, visiting faculty is as refreshing as a glass of ice water when the temperature is 115 degrees.

The visiting faculty of our Institute inspired our total college staff. When they left there appeared to be an immediate loss. Dr. Donald E. O'Beirne and Dr. Robert Karlin demonstrated excellence to both our participants and faculty during their visit. It is recommended that their talents be used in other institutes of this nature. Dr. Nathan Painter and Dr. Norma Richardson both demonstrated the ability to pull concepts together, clarify their meaning, and expand the concepts in a creative manner. Their performance in our Institute merits a recommendation to be used in another institute of this nature.

Mary Keith and Eleanor Frank of the Las Cruces Public Schools used their talents in an effective manner to demonstrate new materials and methods of teaching reading at the secondary level. Their performance merits a recommendation to be used in another institute of this nature.

All Other Part-time Lecturers and Consultants

We were very pleased with the performance of our two 3-day lecturers, Dr. Margaret Early the first week and Dr. Gary Spencer the fourth week. The response to their performance was exceptional and I feel that the timing of their appearances was most appropriate for the success of the Institute. Both Dr. Early and Dr. Spencer had contact with the staff and participants through tele-lecture equipment the seventh week (as well as all part-time instructors of the Institute). The tele-lecture sessions not only demonstrated the technique, but permitted both staff (having returned to their own campus) and participants of the Institute to have the opportunity for after-thoughts together.

Unique Factors of the Institute

The Institute in itself was unique at New Mexico State University because it was the first attempt to meet a specific problem of the area of reading by not using the staid approach currently used. Unique features of this Institute include: (1) team approach of the participants from the same school district, one member representing administration and one member teaching; (2) highly selected participants; (3) a team teaching approach at the university level; (4) concentrated, coordinated reading theory and practice; (5) twenty-thousand dollars worth of equipment and materials which participants examined, experimented with, and demonstrated; (6) an excellent

teaching staff which included a variety of highly trained reading specialists working on a single problem; (7) field trips and tutorial program; (8) an exceptionally positive attitude among staff and participants; (9) support from many sources: participants received support from USOE and encouragement from local schools, newspapers, staff and other participants; staff received support from each other, participants, the University and USOE; (10) scheduled weekly social events to permit participants to relax with a change of pace; (11) a team project: each team prepared a plan of operation for a reading program for their local school (They were excellent); (12) an individual interest project: each participant prepared a review of the current literature related to an individual interest topic. A four-page summary of the literature was recorded with a one-page bibliography. Copies of each summary were made for all participants and placed in a binder. This book is an excellent review of the literature related to the twenty-seven different topics for participants to have for reference and to share with other practitioners.

Use of New Materials

During the duration of the Institute approximately twenty thousand dollars' worth of materials and equipment were viewed, examined and experimented with and demonstrated on New Mexico State University campus Institute facilities. The software materials included samples from every publisher listed in Simmons and Rosenblum, Reading Improvement. Appropriate reading tests were available for examination and use. A broad range of curricular materials was available from the University Educational Curriculum Center for examination and experimentation in reading in content areas. Twenty-three 16 mm films were available for viewing. Programmed instructional

materials were available for examination and use. A thirteen minute videotape, prepared by one of the teams for Institute viewing, related methods of innovating a reading program in a school.

Hardware equipment included closed circuit television systems, audio recording systems, language laboratory, tele-lecture demonstrations using each lecturer and part-time instructor of the Institute. A field trip to view the data processing and retrieval of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools on campus proved enlightening to the participants. Other media materials that teachers can make for their own classrooms were available: rear view projection screens, silent sound lines, multiple colored chalkboards, bulletin boards, and other inexpensive materials to help improve instruction.

Each participant successfully passed a proficiency examination on the rationale and operation of the following equipment:

Controlled reader (EDL)	Keystone telebinocular
Tachistoscope (EDL)	Reading rate controller
Skimmer and Scanner (EDL)	Craig reader
Reading eye camera (EDL)	Controlled reader and films (Psychotechnic)
Listening Center equipment (EDL)	Tachistoscope (Psychotechnic)
Tach-X flasher (EDL)	Reading pacer (Psychotechnic)

Each participant purchased the following textbooks:

Barbe	Teaching Reading: Selected Materials
Hafner	Improving Reading in Secondary Schools
Karlin	Teaching Reading in High Schools
Marksheffel	Better Reading in the Secondary School

What Do the Enrollees Say was the Most Significant Thing that Happened to Them During the Institute?

Participants reported the most significant aspect of the Institute was the unfolding of the psychological principles of teaching from the lecture sessions being used throughout the total structure of the eight-week Institute by the Institute staff. One participant possibly summed it up with these words, "This Institute has been an example of how learning should take place."

What Do You Think?

The director and staff were not conscious of this learning phenomenum at the time; this, however, might be because we were too close to the issue. The director and staff felt the most significant thing that happened to the participants was the forming of teams. The teams were equipped to return to the local schools with a plan of operation and expand a developmental reading program into the secondary level.

What Do Enrollees Say They will do Differently as a Result of the Institute When They Return to their Schools in September?

It was the consensus of the participants that they would each have a greater respect for the individual learner regardless of his prior achievement. Each team expressed the belief that the plan of operation they prepared to implement into their school system would create an effective reading program. Each plan of operation was unique to its setting, designed to meet the local needs of the community. However, each plan included a developmental program with directed reading lessons, individual and group diagnosis of reading problems, individual and group remediation, small and

large group instruction, a wide assortment of materials and equipment, an expansion of the reading materials available to include multiple interests with multiple reading levels, in-service education to expand the concept of reading at the secondary level throughout the professional secondary staff, and the expanded use of teacher-made materials and media.

What Do You Think?

As a Director of the Institute, I feel the intermediate stage of changing behavior is to change the values of the learners. During the Institute it appeared that the participants' values concerning the worth of the human being and his right (as a citizen of the United States) to learn to read did change. The director feels that as the participants returned to their schools with this new value structure they in time will produce permanent changes. I feel that a large number of the plans of operation of each team will be put into operation.

The director was pleased to serve as a consultant to one of the pre-school workshops where the theme for the workshop was "Reading: The Key to Quality Education". This particular workshop demonstrated a high degree of planning. The reading needs of the individual pupil of the classrooms of the district were demonstrated with recommendations for the improvement of instruction by the improvement of reading abilities of children.

Did You Make Any Arrangements for a Follow-up, and If So, What Are They?

The next scheduled personal contact with the participants of the Institute will be at the State Convention of New Mexico Education Association's meeting in Albuquerque in October. The nature of this first follow-up meeting will be a reunion-type breakfast with a progress report from

each team concerning their plan of operation to expand reading at the secondary level. About December first, each participant will be mailed a check list and a list of open-ended questions relating to their progress of innovating the developmental reading program into their school. (See Appendix: Follow-up Evaluation by Participants) New Mexico State University will bear the expense of a site visit to the five teams who work within a radius of 100 miles of New Mexico State University. The objectives of the site visit will be as follows:

1) to see the reading program in its school setting;

2) to identify areas that transfer of training occurred, and

3) to act as a consultant to the reading team as needed.

The results of the follow-up evaluation will be mailed to the United States Office of Education at a later date and may be appended to this document if needed.

Major Strengths of the Institute

The major strengths of an institute should usually be considered as a package because one characteristic frequently supports another while no characteristic alone will produce a successful Institute. It appeared to the director and staff that the major strengths supporting the success of the institute included: 1. one full year in pre-planning with release time of one semester from normal university load to make arrangements for a well planned institute. 2. The careful selection of a group of highly qualified reading specialists and the high selectivity of participant teams (selecting the best 27 participants available). 3. During the Institute the participants were isolated in a positive environment. 4. Participants

were involved in a variety of activities to maintain a high interest level. 5. Participants interacted with the professional staff as: a) a total group, b) in small groups, and c) on an individual basis with time allotted for each. 6. The teacher-pupil ratio was one to four and one-half which enabled the individual attention. 7. Participants arrived as teams and became part of a greater team. The teaching staff used a team approach and emphasized this strength. 8. Materials and equipment worth twenty thousand dollars were available to view, examine, experiment with and demonstrate. 9. Field trips provided a change of pace and new learning experiences. 10. A tutorial program permitted opportunities to experimentally work with children. 11. Peer pressure was a factor. Teaching staff presentations were not only for participants but for other staff members; participants' performances were not only for the university teaching staff but their professional colleagues. 12. The attitude of the staff and the participants was exceptionally positive during the total Institute. 13. A scheduled weekly social event where all participants and staff socialized together added to the spirit of the Institute. 14. Flexibility within the daily program to meet the individual and group needs of the participants permitted an exceptional structure for learning to take place.

Major Weaknesses

When all the participants evaluated the Institute at the end of four weeks, there was concern about: 1. the uses of small groups, 2. staff efforts made to provide individual counseling, and 3. time in the schedule allowed for discussion with staff and other participants outside of the formal program. According to the participants' evaluation at the end of the

Institute, a revision of the daily schedule and the faculty awareness of these concerns appeared to correct the situation. (See Appendix: Institute Evaluation By Participant.)

Major Problems Encountered and Your Solutions

Daily problems were encountered during the pre-planning and the execution of the Institute. Being a novice in directing an institute of this nature, the director assumed that these daily problems were routine. Issues were not created; solutions were quietly sought.

What Is Your Evaluation of Each of the Following Aspects of Your Institute and What Would You Change If You Were to Direct Another Institute?

A. Objectives

The director felt the objectives of the Institute were clearly stated and practical. It appeared to the professional staff that the objectives of the Institute were within the reach of all participants.

B. Optimum Number of Grade Levels Included

The Institute was designed to expand the developmental reading concept into the secondary level, grades 7-12. It was the opinion of the Institute staff that this should be the optimum range because of the uniqueness of the secondary teacher and the shortage of secondary reading programs in the Southwest.

C. Beginning dates (Too early and too late for some participants)

In the geographical Southwest, all public schools had been closed at least one week prior to the opening of the Institute. The staff felt the dates were appropriate.

D. Optimum Number of Weeks

Some of the participants indicated a desire that the Institute be expanded another two weeks, however the director felt the objectives of the Institute had been met at the conclusion of the eight week period. It was noted about the end of the seventh week that fatigue was starting to hit some of the participants.

E. Participants

1) Optimum number of participants

Our original proposal requested 30 participants and we were awarded 27. It was the opinion of the staff and director that with the facilities present we could have been just as effective with possibly 36 participants; however, with the eight week Institute we would not want to attempt more than 36 participants.

2) One participant versus more than one participant from each school and

3) Teachers versus Teachers and Supervisors

The staff was very enthusiastic about the team arrangement of participants. Each teams consisted of a principal and one or more teachers from the same school. In the past we have held workshops for teachers and they would complain "we feel this is a marvelous idea, however my principal won't buy it." We would then have workshops for principals and they would complain "this is a marvelous idea but you don't know the teachers I work with." In our Institute we eliminated this problem and developed a team of leadership from both administration and teaching staff to return to the local school, thus enabling them to make a greater impact.

F. Code in the Proposal Describing the Institute - Was the Code Useful? Would You Change Your Code or Categories in the Code?

The director felt the code was very helpful in the selection of teams and participants. Only five participants selected had a course in reading and twenty-two participants had never had a course in reading. In selecting teams our brochure invited supervisors to apply with teachers. Very few supervisors made application because of code 3. In a future proposal, if supervisors were to be attracted, the director would give consideration to possibly permitting supervisors to attend under a different code.

G. Distribution of Time (in classroom versus free time)

The Institute schedule appeared to be very rigorous and yet the flexibility within the schedule permitted it to be very functional. For all participants three 2-hour blocks were scheduled three days a week, and two 2-hour blocks were scheduled two days a week. The additional time in the classroom, laboratory, and curriculum center was under the direct supervision of the Institute staff.

H. Emphasis on Substantive Content versus Teaching Skills

The instruction staff made an effective continuous effort to maintain a balance between methods and materials, practice and theory, and books and learning throughout the Institute.

I. Ratio of Staff to Participants

The ratio of one to four and one-half provided the opportunities for many staff-guided small group seminars; an excellent ratio for an eight-week Institute directed toward effective learning.

J. Budget

The director was very pleased with the financial aspects and relationships with the United States Office of Education. New Mexico State University, through the Business Office, authorized the disbursion of funds as outlined in the revised budget. The director noted no irregular occurrences.

Potential Impact of the Institute on the Regular Academic Year's Program of Your Institution

A. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education had a Masters of Arts for Teaching program with NCATE accreditation, but no MAT degree program in reading. When the Institute was funded, the area of specialization, "secondary reading" was added to this Masters of Arts for Teaching degree.

B. Sixteen of the twenty-seven participants have been admitted to the advanced degree programs at New Mexico State University.

C. The professorial staff in the College of Education have become aware of the fact that the improvement of reading is not only a local problem but a national problem.

D. The course, Education 456, Reading in The Secondary School, will add a tutorial phase to provide opportunity to work with children.

E. A team teaching approach at the University level will be added, including a block of course work in reading.

V. APPENDIX

1. Name and Home Address of Participants
2. Pre-institute School Addresses of Participants
3. Post-institute School Addresses of Participants
4. Institute Evaluation by Participants
5. Follow-up Evaluation by Participants
6. Newsletters to Participants

PARTICIPANTS' HOME ADDRESSES

Mr. Jess J. Andersen	815 Lee's Drive	Las Cruces, N.M. 88001
Mr. David W. Aragon	2290-C 39th Street	Los Alamos, N.M. 87544
Mr. Presley Askew	1301 East Branson	Las Cruces, N.M. 88001
Mr. James T. Brewster	Box 127	Garfield, New Mexico
Mr. Marcus G. Burk	7920 Royal Court	Tucson, Arizona 85704
Mr. Daryl W. Davis	Rt. 1, Box 231A	Roswell, N.M. 88201
Mr. Lester T. Henderson	Box 7	Cloudcroft, N.M. 88317
Mr. Bert Holland, Jr.	2360 Rosedale Drive	Las Cruces, N.M. 88001
Mr. Joe L. Karr	8805 McFall	El Paso, Texas 79925
Mrs. Anna J. Kastning	143 Sunset Drive	Gallup, N.M. 87301
Mrs. Glenna T. Kyker	204 Verdi	Gallup, N.M. 87301
Mr. Wesley H. Lane	Box 346	Cloudcroft, N.M. 88317
Mr. James A. Miller	701 East Mesa	Gallup, N.M. 87301
Mr. Howard O. Miller	Box 198	Cloudcroft, N.M. 88317
Mrs. Sharon A. Modi	Box 733	University Park, N.M.
Mr. Eugene E. Parker	Box 265	Hatch, N.M. 87937
Mrs. Jessie M. Reed	225 West Fleming	Las Cruces, N.M. 88001
Mrs. Myrth W. Rollins	3975 Las Vegas Drive	El Paso, Texas 79902
Mr. Ted Sorich	1282 West Smoot Place	Tucson, Arizona 85704
Mr. Edward E. Spence	1483 40th Street	Los Alamos, N.M. 87544
Mr. Irvin G. Stephens	2804 North Orchard	Roswell, N.M. 88201
Mrs. Barbara J. Taylor	1810 Cole Village	Las Cruces, N.M. 88001
Mr. Ernest A. Traylor	2306 Berkeley Drive	Roswell, N.M. 88201
Mr. Arthur J. Trujillo	P.O. Box 481	Zuni, New Mexico 87327
Mr. Paul David Weisenborn	1211 West Knox Place	Tucson, Arizonia 85705
Mr. Jess C. Williams	441 North Miranda	Las Cruces, N.M. 88001
Mrs. Barbara R. Wooten	734 E. Uintah Street	Colorado Springs, Co. 80903

PRE-NDEA INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS' SCHOOL ADDRESSES

Mr. Jess J. Andersen	Alameda Jr. High School, 808 N. Alameda, Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001
Mr. David W. Aragon	Pueblo Jr. High School, 1900 Diamond Dr., Los Alamos, New Mexico
Mr. Presley Askew	Hatch Valley Jr. High School, Hatch, New Mexico
Mr. James T. Brewster	Hatch Valley High School, Hatch, New Mexico
Mr. Marcus G. Burk	Flowing Wells Jr. High School, 3725 N. Flowing Wells Road, Tucson, Arizona 85705
Mr. Daryl W. Davis	Goddard High School, 701 E. Country Club Road, Roswell, New Mexico
Mr. Lester T. Henderson	Cloudcroft Municipal Schools, P.O. Box 198, Cloudcroft, New Mexico
Mr. Bert Holland, Jr.	Court Jr. High School, 410 W. Court Street, Las Cruces, New Mexico
Mr. Joe L. Karr	Newman School, 10275 Alcan, El Paso, Texas 79924
Mrs. Anna J. Kastning	Gallup Jr. High School, 1001 Grandview, Gallup, N.M.
Mrs. Glenna T. Kyker	Gallup High Schools, Box 39, Gallup, N.M. 87301
Mr. Wesley H. Lane	Cloudcroft Municipal Schools, Box 198, Cloudcroft, New Mexico
Mr. James A. Miller	Gallup Jr. High School, 1001 S. Grandview, Gallup, New Mexico
Mr. Howard O. Miller	Cloudcroft High School, Cloudcroft, New Mexico
Mrs. Sharon A. Modi	Hatch Valley Jr. High School, Hatch, New Mexico
Mr. Eugene E. Parker	Hatch Valley Municipal Schools, Hatch, New Mexico
Mrs. Jessie H. Reed	Alameda Jr. High School, 808 N. Alameda, Las Cruces, New Mexico
Mrs. Myrth W. Rollins	Stephen F. Austin High School, 3500 Memphis, El Paso, Texas
Mr. Ted Sorich	Flowing Wells High School, 3725 N. Flowing Wells Road, Tucson, Arizona 85705
Mr. Edward E. Spence	Pueblo Jr. High School, 1900 Diamond Drive, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544
Mr. Irvin G. Stephens	Goddard Sr. High School, 601 E. Country Club Road, Roswell, New Mexico 88201
Mrs. Barbara J. Taylor	Alameda Jr. High School, 808 N. Alameda, Las Cruces, New Mexico
Mr. Ernest A. Traylor	Robert H. Goddard High School, 701 E. Country Club Road, Roswell, New Mexico 88201
Mr. Arthur J. Trujillo	Zuni Secondary School, P.O. Box 505, Zuni, New Mexico 87327
Mr. Paul D. Weisenborn	Flowing Wells Jr. High School, 3725 N. Flowing Wells Road, Tucson, Arizona 85705
Mr. Jess C. Williams	Court Jr. High School, 410 W. Court Street, Las Cruces, New Mexico
Mrs. Barbara R. Wooten	Harrison Jr. High School, 1600 Harrison Road, Colorado Springs, Colorado

POST-NDEA INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS' SCHOOL ADDRESS CHANGES

Mr. David W. Aragon Assistant Principal	Gallup High School, 406 Defiance, Gallup, New Mexico

INSTITUTE EVALUATION BY PARTICIPANTS

This check sheet was administered at the end of the fourth week of the Institute and at the end of the eighth week of the Institute.

*The upper number is the fourth week tally.
**The lower number is the eighth week tally.
Note: Only 26 participants evaluated the eighth week
(One member was hospitalized)

DIRECTIONS: For the statements in this group check one response only.

		Very good	Good	Adequate	Inadequate	Very Inadequate	No opinion
1. Objectives							
1.1 The degree to which the Institute helped me attain my objectives was:	1.1*	11	12	2	2		
	1.1**	18	8				
1.2 My understanding of the objectives of the Institute prior to the beginning of the program was:	1.2	1	11	8	5	2	
		5	9	5	6	1	
1.3 In terms of clarity and comprehension the proposed objectives of the Institute were:	1.3	1	19	5	1	1	
		11	11	3	1		
1.4 The achievement of the objectives of the Institute, according to my understanding of them, was:	1.4	9	12	5	1		
		15	8	2	1		
1.5 The degree to which the competency of the group was in keeping with the objective was:	1.5	8	13	5	1		
		15	10	1			
1.6 As a method for improving teacher competencies and knowledge in reading, the Institute program was:	1.6	16	8	2	1		
		15	11				
2. Organization and Administration							
2.1 The total length of the Institute was:	2.1	8	14	3	1		1
		6	15	2	3		
2.2 The length of the Institute day was:	2.2	8	14	4	1		
		7	14	3	2		

		Very good	Good	Adequate	Inadequate	Very Inadequate	No opinion
2.3 The length of the Institute week was:	2.3	14 9	11 15	2 2			
2.4 The time scheduled for the academic program was:	2.4	11 7	10 15	5 2	1 2		
2.5 The degree to which the schedule allowed for discussion with staff and other participants outside the formal program was:	2.5	5 12	6 6	7 5	8 3		1
2.6 The effort made to provide individual counseling was:	2.6	1 8	8 9	6 3	10 6	1	1
2.7 The size of the total group in the Institute was:	2.7	19 19	7 5	1 2			
2.8 The manner in which small groups were used was:	2.8	8	9 9	6 7	10 2	1	1
2.9 The classroom facilities were:	2.9	6 8	6 7	10 8	4 3	1	
2.10 The library facilities were:	2.10	15 17	7 7	3 1	1 1		1
2.11 The library personnel were:	2.11	15 14	10 8	3	1	1	1
2.12 Time allowed for recreation was:	2.12	9 12	12 11	5 3	1		
2.13 Time allotted for social activities was:	2.13	14 14	10 9	2 3		1	
2.14 The recreational facilities available were:	2.14	10 13	13 8	3 4		1	1
2.15 The opportunities for social and cultural activities were:	2.15	6 15	16 9	3 2	1	1	

3. Instruction and Staff

		Very good	Good	Adequate	Inadequate	Very Inadequate	No opinion
3.1 The extent to which the Institute met my expectations in the overall content of lectures and other activities was:	3.1	18 14	7 11	2 1			
3.2 In comparison to previous educational programs in which I have participated, the quantity of instruction was:	3.2	24 18	2 8	1			
3.3 The balance maintained by the Institute program between theory and practice was:	3.3	5 9	12 12	6 3	3 2		1
3.4 Learning that resulted from lecture sessions was:	3.4	11 15	14 9	2 1	 1		
3.5 Learning that resulted from discussions was:	3.5	8 9	12 13	5 3	1	1 1	
3.6 Learning that resulted from practicum activities was:	3.6	4 8	14 10	5 7	1 1		3
3.7 Learning that resulted from demonstrations of reading materials was:	3.7	1 5	10 9	10 7	4 5	1	1
3.8 Learning that resulted from the field trips was:	3.8	6 7	11 14	7 5	3		
3.9 Learning that resulted from outside speakers was:	3.9	18 19	6 5	3 2			
3.10 The extent to which the outside speaker was integrated into the total program was:	3.10	15 17	7 8	3 1	2		
3.11 The opportunities provided to learn new methods of teaching reading were:	3.11	15 12	4 9	7 4	1 1		
3.12 The opportunities provided to become aware of newer materials and media in reading were:	3.12	13 13	8 12	6 1			

		Very good	Good	Adequate	Inadequate	Very Inadequate	No opinion
3.13 The time available to work with new materials and media in reading was:	3.13	4 6	5 10	10 7	7 3	1	
3.14 The opportunities to become acquainted with informal methods of assessing reading developments was:	3.14	5 6	15 13	3 7	4		
3.15 The opportunities to become acquainted with standardized, survey, and diagnostic reading tests were:	3.15	6 8	10 7	6 9	5 2		
3.16 The degree to which participants were made aware of the value of school records as an aid in reading instruction was:	3.16	5 5	5 11	12 8	4 2		1
3.17 The ratio of instructors to participants was:	3.17	17 17	7 6	3 3			
3.18 The competency of the Institute faculty and their choice for the job was:	3.18	23 20	3 6	1			
3.19 The interaction between participants was:	3.19	12 17	9 9	6			
3.20 The interaction between staff and participants was:	3.20	14 17	8 8	2	3 1		
3.21 The degree to which the Institute provided opportunity to become acquainted with recent professional literature in the field of reading was:	3.21	9 16	12 7	3 3	2		1
3.22 The attitude of the staff toward the participants was:	3.22	20 17	4 8	3			1
3.23 The value of using new reading materials and machines was:	3.23	8 10	10 14	5 2	3		1

4. Effects on Participants

		Very good	Good	Adequate	Inadequate	Very Inadequate	No opinion
4.1 The extent to which the Institute was instrumental in clarifying my own perception regarding the need for improved teaching of reading at my level was:	4.1	18 20	8 5	1 1			
4.2 As a result of the Institute my confidence in teaching reading at the one level at which I am teaching is:	4.2	10 13	12 9	4 2	1		2
4.3 As a result of the Institute my confidence in teaching reading at all levels is:	4.3	11 10	8 11	5 4	2 1	1	
4.4 The challenge to my intellectual capacities during the Institute Program was:	4.4	18 14	8 12	1			
4.5 I feel my ability to motivate students, lead them to voluntary efforts, and encourage them to set higher standards for themselves will, as a result of the program, be:	4.5	9 11	16 12	1 3	1		
4.6 The change in attitude and behavior is as a result of the Institute for most of the participants in my group was:	4.6	10 11	13 13	2 1	1		1 1
4.7 The extent to which professional opportunities in the field of reading were clarified in the program was:	4.7	11 10	9 14	4 2	3		
4.8 Information presented regarding the role of the International Reading Association and professional participation in reading was:	4.8	9 7	7 16	9 2	1 1		1
4.9 The extent to which the Institute aided me in originating new ideas and creating new teaching concepts was:	4.9	14 14	10 10	3 2			
4.10 The degree to which the Institute increased my desire to try new teaching methods was:	4.10	19 20	6 6	2			

		Very good	Good	Adequate	Inadequate	Very Inadequate	No opinion
4.11 The extent to which the Institute developed my ability to organize teaching materials was:	4.11	4 9	15 15	8 2			
4.12 The degree to which the Institute stimulated my continued interest in teaching was:	4.12	21 19	3 6	3 1			

Please complete the following Post-Institute Evaluation and return to Dr. Richard P. Williams, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico, in the enclosed envelope.

FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION BY PARTICIPANTS

OF NDEA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN READING

AT NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY, SUMMER 1967

DIRECTIONS: For the statements in this group check one response only.

		Very good	Good	Adequate	Inadequate	Very Inadequate	No opinion
1.1 The extent to which the Institute was instrumental in clarifying my own perception regarding the need for improved teaching of reading at my level was:	1.1						
1.2 As a result of the Institute my confidence in teaching reading at the level at which I am teaching has improved.	1.2						
1.3 As a result of the Institute my confidence in teaching reading at all levels has improved.	1.3						
1.4 The challenge to my intellectual capacities during the Institute program was:	1.4						
1.5 I feel my ability to motivate students, lead them to voluntary efforts, and encourage them to set higher standards for themselves is, as a result of the program:	1.5						
1.6 The extent to which the Institute aided me in originating new ideas and creating new teaching concepts was:	1.6						

		Very good	Good	Adequate	Inadequate	Very Inadequate	No opinion
2.1 The degree to which the Institute increased my desire to try new teaching methods was:	2.1						
2.2 The extent to which the Institute developed my ability to organize teaching materials was:	2.2						
2.3 The degree to which the Institute stimulated my continued interest in teaching was:	2.3						
2.4 The achievement of the objectives of the Institute, according to my understanding of them, was:	2.4						
2.5 As a method for improving teacher competencies and knowledge in reading, the Institute program was:	2.5						
3.1 The organization and administration of the Institute was:	3.1						
3.2 The competency of the Institute faculty and their choice for the job was:	3.2						
3.3 In comparison to previous educational programs in which I have participated, the quantity of instruction was:	3.3						
3.4 The opportunities provided to become aware of newer materials and media in reading were:	3.4						

Please respond to each of the following questions in the space provided unless you feel additional space is needed.

4.1 Participants' participation with director and staff during the Institute was

4.2 Twenty thousand dollars of materials and equipment on display for browsing, borrowing, and experimentation and demonstration caused me to

4.3 Major strengths of the Institute would include

4.4 Major weaknesses of the Institute would include

4.5 The broad variety of reading specialists as instructors and lecturers caused me to

5.1 The most significant thing that happened to me during the Institute was

5.2 If I could attend another NDEA Institute in Reading, I would suggest the Institute would

5.3 The plan of operation my team prepared

5.4 The area I feel the greatest amount of learning took place was

5.5 Identify changes in your educational practices as a result of attending the Institute

COPY

Newsletter Number 1 May 15, 1967

CONGRATULATIONS AND WELCOME!

We have planned a series of Newsletters to keep you informed about the developments of the Institute and to answer questions which we think you may ask. If, after a couple of Newsletters you still have questions, please write us immediately. We will either answer you individually or include the answer in the Newsletter.

I. MATRICULATION

I am very pleased to report the Graduate Office has received the application form needed to admit you to the Graduate College. Do not be concerned if you receive a letter from the Graduate Office informing you that you have been admitted as a "special student." This means that you can receive the academic credit 8 semester hours graduate work but you are not formally admitted to a Graduate program of New Mexico State University. Should you wish to be classified in a particular program at New Mexico State, this transaction can be completed while you are on campus this summer (which will save a lot of red tape).
Please send a carbon of any future correspondence to the University to us. If you receive correspondence from the College of Teacher Education about being a matriculated candidate but wish to be only a special student, send them a note indicating that you are a participant to the NDEA Institute in Reading for the summer of 1967, and you have been granted the status of "special student." Sounds simple, doesn't it? Well, it isn't!!!

II. REGISTRATION

We will pre-register and register you. We will make every effort to ensure that you have to stand in no lines except possibly the restaurants and cafeterias.

COPY

Newsletter Number 1

III. PAYMENT OF STIPEND

All teachers are interested in money, not because they want to be but because they have to be. Hence, the first stipend payment will be made available to you during the orientation period June 12. It will be made by check and we will make arrangements with local banks to ensure your ability to cash them if you desire without difficulty.

Percentage of Payment	Date
One-third of stipend	June 12
One-third of stipend	July 7
One-third of stipend	August 4

IV. HOUSING

The Director of Housing at New Mexico State University has assured me he has forwarded to you information concerning facilities on campus. He also informed me that he has received few of these forms by return mail. Please mail the return form related to housing to

Mr. John Burrows
Director of Housing
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001

immediately. If you do not plan to live on campus, please check "off campus", and return the form.

Las Cruces has been blessed with several new housing facilities. If you wish to live off campus, I suggest you visit one of them.

V. PHOTOGRAPH AND BIOGRAPHY

At your earliest possible convenience would you please send us a small photograph of yourself. Passport size would be ideal. We hope to be able to reproduce these and distribute them to all NDEA faculty and participants so that we may get to know one another. Remember, the Institute lasts only 8 weeks and we will have only a short time to get acquainted.

Also send us a brief biography to include where you are employed, special duties, other educational experience, hobbies, a bit about your family and number of children, and other pertinent data you feel beneficial.

COPY

Newsletter Number 1

VI. OUR OFFICE

Please remember our office has one and only one function --to assist you in any way possible. If you have any suggestions or complaints, please do not hesitate to write.

We hope to be sending you one Newsletter a week from now until the beginning of the Institute. Further Newsletters will include the following:

Biographies of all faculty and administrative staff;
Biographies and photographs, we hope, of all NDEA participants;
Information about New Mexico State University and the Las Cruces area;
Information regarding the courses, including syllabi and texts;
Other helpful items concerning our administration and your participation in the summer institute.

COPY

Newsletter Number 2 May 22, 1967

I. AN OVERVIEW OF INSTITUTE TOPICS:

First Week June 12 - 16

A. The Reading Process

B. The Use of Diagnostic Measures of Reading Ability

Second Week June 19 - 23

A. Motivation and Interest of the Adolescent Reader

B. The Nature of the Developmental Reading Program (7-12)

Third Week June 26 - 30

A. The Administration and Organization of the Developmental Reading Program

B. Designing a Workable Reading Program

Fourth Week July 3 - 7

A. Unique Problems in Teaching Reading in the Spanish Southwest

B. Techniques in Overcoming Reading Problems of the Spanish Southwest

Fifth Week July 10 - 14

A. Teaching Word Recognition Skills

B. Teaching Comprehension Skills

COPY

Newsletter Number 2

Sixth Week July 17 - 21

A. Teaching Study Skills

B. Teaching Skills of Reading in the Content Areas

Seventh Week July 24 - 28

A. New Educational Media for Teaching Reading

B. Techniques in Selecting Materials to Meet Classroom Objectives

Eighth Week July 31 - August 4

A. Techniques of Evaluation of a Reading Program

B. Action Research and the Reading Program

II. DAILY SCHEDULE

The daily program of instruction will be flexible, however the following format will be used as a guide.

Monday - Friday

8:00 - 10:00	Formal instruction
10:00 - 10:15	Coffee break
10:15 - 12:00	Individual proficiency development
1:00 - 3:00	Formal instruction

III. REQUIRED TEXTS

The University Bookstore at New Mexico State University has received our textbooks for the summer. To avoid standing in line for textbooks, arrangements have been made for the University Bookstore to bring the following textbooks to our classroom June 12 for your purchase. These books include:

Teaching Reading in High Schools	Karlin
Teaching Reading: Selected Materials	Barbe
Better Reading in the Secondary School	Marksheffel
Improving Reading in Secondary Schools	Hafner

COPY

Newsletter Number 2

IV. ACTIVITIES

It seems that thus far in the Newsletter we have told you a great deal about the academic side of the program. We should mention that although the formal program will be strenuous, we certainly do not expect you to spend 8 weeks in the library! We have made a great effort to organize a schedule that you will enjoy and that will be practical and interesting.

We believe we have also planned one of the most complete and interesting informal programs ever offered by a summer institute. We are planning several institute parties and one combined gala with another institute on our campus and an institute on a neighboring campus. As soon as we have complete arrangements, we will be sending you information about how to obtain theatre tickets and tickets to ball games and concerts. So. . . we hope that you will not only learn a lot this summer but that the opportunities to relax will keep the program from becoming too much of a grind.

V. PHOTOGRAPH AND BIOGRAPHY

We appreciate the excellent response to our request for a small photograph of yourself and a brief biography. Those who have not taken time to do this would help our office to be more efficient by an immediate response.

VI. ENCLOSED BROCHURE

The enclosed brochure will give a quick glance at pertinent information about New Mexico State University. Please save, for the inside map will prove valuable in the future. Our office is in Building 25, Teacher Education, room 105. Our meeting place for the Institute will be in the circular Building 20, Fine Arts Center, rooms 206 and 214.

VII. ATHLETIC EQUIPMENT AND ???

New Mexico State University has excellent facilities for golf (bring the clubs), bowling (bring the ball), tennis (bring the racket), swimming (bring the suit), and playing courts for other activities. Be sure to bring musical instruments and needed props for skits, stunts and short plays.

COPY

Newsletter Number 3 May 29, 1967

I. QUIET AND PEACE BEFORE THE MAD RUSH

There is a great calm on the campus of New Mexico State University as there is probably a great calm in the halls of your school with the students gone. However, we are expecting you in the Fine Arts Center, Room 214 at 8 a.m. June 12 (who said "the greatest calm before the storm"?) We are exerting every effort to make your arrival and stay at New Mexico State University a pleasant experience.

II. LAS CRUCES, NEW MEXICO

Enclosed is a brochure from the Mesilla Valley Chamber of Commerce with pertinent information concerning the city and surrounding areas. Please do not be misled by the caption "Gateway to the Moon". Las Cruces is not the end of the world!

III. PREVIEW OF A FIELD TRIP

During the week of July 3, Institute participants and staff will adventure by refrigerated bus to Mescalero Indian territory. Cultural, educational and environmental conditions of the American Indian will be explored during this trip. We will also be able to witness the ceremonial dances and rituals of the Mescaleros the 4th of July.

IV. SOME INTERESTING DATA CONCERNING THE FACULTY OF OUR INSTITUTE

Dr. Nathan Painter is presently a principal with the Phoenix Public Schools. His 20 years with the Phoenix Public Schools in teaching, administration, and research with predominantly Mexican, Spanish-American boys and girls has provided a background of experiences for our geographical area. He holds the MA degree and Ed.D degree from Arizona State University with specialization in reading and language learning.

COPY

Newsletter Number 3

Dr. Norma Richardson is presently a director of the Office of Economic Opportunity program, Tempe, Arizona. For the past five years she has served as a demonstration teacher at Arizona State University Laboratory School. She holds the MA degree and the Ed D degree from Arizona State University.

Dr. Margaret Early is presently a Professor of Education and Associative Director of the Reading Center at Syracuse University where she teaches courses in reading and language arts. She is a member of the Evaluation Committee of the International Reading Association. Dr. Early is a member of the editorial advisory staff for the Journal of Reading and the Reading Research Quarterly. She edited Perspectives in Reading, No. 2, Reading Instruction in the Secondary Schools.

Dr. Robert Karlin is presently Professor of Education and Coordinator, Graduate Arts and Reading Program, Queens College of the City of New York. He is author of the reading textbook Teaching Reading in the High School and general editor, Perspectives in Reading Series publications of the International Reading Association. He holds the MA degree and the PhD degree from New York University. He has published several dozen articles in leading journals and has served as consultant to universities throughout the United States.

Dr. Gary D. Spencer is presently an Associate Professor of Education at Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama. For the past three years he has served as Director of the Reading Clinic at Auburn University. During the summer of 1965 Dr. Spencer served as the director of a summer NDEA Institute at Auburn University for the United States Office of Education. During the summer of 1966 he served as the director of an institute for the Office of Economic Opportunity. He has served as a lecturer and consultant to professional organizations and school districts.

Dr. Donald E. O'Beirne is presently a Professor of Education at Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona. He is the past Head of his department and Director of the University Reading Clinic. Presently he is the Distinguished Professor for Teaching at Arizona State University.

COPY

Newsletter Number 3

Dr. O'Beirne is recognized internationally as well as nationally. He was selected as general session speaker at the 1964 International Reading Conference at Oxford University and is currently a reading consultant at the University of London and the University of Nigeria.

Mary T. Keith is presently Consultant of Reading and Curriculum in the Las Cruces Public School System. Her present services include: 1) diagnosis of learning problems and in this portion of the program the purpose is to isolate factors contributing to learning problems of individual children, with recommendations for correction; 2) general assistance on the reading programs which involves advice on identification of group techniques of teaching and instructional materials; 3) individual and small group instruction where limited numbers of children, whose needs cannot be met in the classroom, are helped in specific problem areas. Mrs. Keith is currently Chairman of the Reading Section for the New Mexico Education Association. She has 78 semester hours of graduate credit including an Educational Specialist Degree.

Eleanor Frank is presently a reading specialist at the secondary level with the Las Cruces Public Schools, Las Cruces, New Mexico. She has conducted in-service workshops for reading teachers. She holds the MA degree from New Mexico Western University and the Ed.S degree in reading from New Mexico State University. In 1966 she was selected as the State demonstration teacher of reading at the secondary level.

COPY

Newsletter Number 4 June 5, 1967

I. SOME EATING ESTABLISHMENTS YOU MIGHT BE INTERESTED IN
(Remember, Everyone has a different digestive tract)

Baskins & Robbins (31) Ice Cream Store, 1492 East Missouri	526-9933
Carlton's Cafeteria, 2225 S. Main	523-1807
Casa Luna Italian Resturant, 1340 E. Lohman	524-9968
China Temple, 1510 S. Solano Drive	526-6497
Cork 'N Bottle Restaurant & Lounge, 503 S. Solano	524-7033
El Patio, Old Mesilla	526-9943
Gamboa's Restaurant, 1008 S. Solano	526-8332
Honey Dew Cafe, 1415 E. Missouri	526-5338
Kentucky Fried Chicken, 750 S. Solano	523-1356
La Posta, Old Mesilla	524-4581
Len's Coffee House, 1155 S. Seventh	524-2987
Luby's Cafeteria, 75 Loretto Shopping Center	524-8448
Lucero's Steak House, 1760 W. Picacho	524-2901
New Mexico Spanish Kitchen, 1990 N. Main	526-9959
Pancake House, 1765 South Main	524-9422
Tode's T-Bone, Hwy. 70 east	526-6036
Topper Drive-in & Restaurant, 2405 S. Truck By-Pass and Main	526-2111
Tugo's Italian Restaurant, 800 North Main	524-0895
Villa Capri Pizzeria, 820 South Solano	526-9885

II. HOTELS AND MOTELS FOR VERY EARLY ARRIVALS

Amador Hotel, rates $2-5.00, Amador & Water Sts	524-4641
Broadway Motel & Restaurant, rates $4.50-9.00 450 West Picacho	526-5511
Holiday Inn & Restaurant, rates $7-13.50, 2155 West Picacho	524-7725
Imperial "400" Motel, rates $7-13.00, 1865 West Picacho	524-2848
Mission Inn, rates $6-13.00, 1765 S. Main	526-6605
Neff Motel, rates $5-12.50, 1409 W. Picacho	526-2451
Palms Motor Hotel & Restaurant, rates $8-15.00 2405 West Picacho Avenue	524-1953
Ramada Inn & Restaurant, rates $7-15.00, 2160 West Picacho Avenue	524-3671

All major motels have their own restaurants.

COPY

Newsletter Number 4

III. RECREATIONAL AREAS

Regularly scheduled recreational and social events including campus plays and films are available to Institute participants. The University also offers excellent facilities for swimming, bowling, tennis and golf.

In addition to University offerings and facilities for recreation, there are many interesting attractions within easy driving distance. A short journey will take you to White Sands National Park, 55 miles east of Las Cruces on Hwy. 70, Fort Seldon, 12 miles north on Hwy. 85, City of Rocks State Park, 75 miles west, and Old Mexico, about an hour's drive. On the outskirts of Las Cruces the Stahmann Farms draw many visitors, as does Old Mesilla with its air of antiquity in which to enjoy Mexican food and drink, browse around the patio's many shops, bookstores and art galleries, and museum.

IV. SOME INTERESTING DATA CONCERNING PARTICIPANTS OF OUR INSTITUTE

Just a word about each of our participants. You may find some are already known to you, others will seem more familiar if you can learn a thing or two about them before you meet!

Jess J. Andersen is Principal of Alameda Junior High School in Las Cruces. Prior to 1956 he was Principal, Junior-Senior High School in Socorro, N. M., has earned 33 post-masters degree hours in administration and curriculum development. He is married, has six children ranging from 10 to 22. Enjoys reading, camping, fishing and table tennis.

David Aragon is employed as Reading Coordinator at Pueblo Junior High School, Los Alamos, N. M. Attended European schools for six years. Enjoys hunting, fishing, reading, numismatics. Mr. Aragon is married, has a boy and a girl.

Presley Askew, "Coach" to many local athletes, presently teaches language arts and history at Hatch Valley Junior High School, Hatch, N. M. Member Lions Club, NMEA National Coaches Association. Was honored as Conference Coach of the Year: Helms Foundation Hall of Fame. His wife is Music Specialist in Las Cruces Public Schools. Lists his three grandchildren as his hobby.

James T. Brewster, also a teacher at Hatch Valley, outdoes Mr. Askew with eleven grandchildren! Has farmed and ranched in Hatch many years, raises quarter horses. Served in New Mexico State Senate 1945 to 1953.

COPY

Newsletter Number 4

Marcus Burk comes to us from Tucson, Arizona where he is Assistant Principal, Flowing Wells Junior High School. He is married, has four children. Enjoys most all sports, camping, and woodworking.

Daryl W. Davis of Goddard High School in Roswell, has taught English in Texas and New Mexico high schools and Roswell Community College. Says he has at one time or another done almost every kind of work except selling women's shoes! His wife is working toward a teaching certificate when care of their three children will allow.

Lester T. Henderson is assisting with the Special Reading Program of Cloudcroft Municipal Schools. Married, has a son, 17, twin daughters, 13, and a daughter, 8. Active in local civic affairs, operates Trailer Park and Cabins in Cloudcroft. Enjoys chess.. Another coin collector, Mr. Aragon!

Joe L. Karr is Principal, Newman School, El Paso, Texas. Attended Institutes at Florida A & M in 1964 and 1965. His wife teaches remedial reading and cares for five children, aged 5-15.

Mrs. Anna J. Kastning "graduated" from elementary teaching to teach reading in Gallup Junior High two years ago. She has attended summer workshops in reading. Mrs. Kastning has a daughter, age 16.

Mrs. Glenna Kyker's special mission is to keep potential drop-outs in school "by giving them a new sense of personal dignity and teaching them to read." She works with Navajo and Spanish-American children, as ESL consultant at Gallup, N. M. Daughters, 5 and 7, divert her from needing hobbies just now.

Wesley H. Lane is Principal of Cloudcroft Municipal Schools. Served in U. S. Navy 4 years, had a dry cleaning business and is still a licensed barber. Is Past President of the Cloudcroft Lions Club, now serving as Vice President, New Mexico Activities Association from District 5B. Married, has 3 sons.

James A. Miller, Principal of Gallup Junior High School, is a NMSU graduate with MA from Highlands University. Has attended various workshops and seminars. Is married, has 3 sons with whom he enjoys all kinds of sports. He is a golfer, takes an interest in new people and places.

COPY

Newsletter Number 4

Harold O. Miller teaches English and Reading at Cloudcroft High School, also has taught vocal music. He is married.

Mrs. Sharon Ann Modi lives in Las Cruces with her husband, who is a civil engineering student at NMSU, and their three year old daughter. She teaches at Hatch Valley School, has been elected 7th grade sponsor for next year. Very interested in archaeology.

Eugene E. Parker, Principal, Hatch Valley Junior High School, is another NMSU graduate with BS and MS degrees. Also attended Brigham Young University for graduate work. His wife is an elementary school teacher. Their son is studying law at University of Utah. Enjoys gardening and travel.

Donald L. Pedrie is Principal of Harrison Junior High School in Colorado Springs, Colorado. Holds BS and MS degrees from Colorado State University and Ed.S from Western State College. He is married, has two sons, Kim and Kip.

Mrs. Jessie M. Reed teaches in Alameda Junior High, Las Cruces. She is a graduate of Mansfield (Pa.) State College and studied summers at University of Scranton (Pa.). She is proficient in piano and flute. She is kept busy with home, husband and two toddlers.

Myrth W. Rollins teaches English at Stephen Austin High School in El Paso, has done special studies in teaching English as a foreign language and plans to do a Master's thesis on some aspect of this area. She graduated from college with her oldest son! She is an avid reader and has studied oil painting. Her two sons are in business with her husband; their daughter just graduated from high school.

Ted Sorich is Assistant Principal at Flowing Wells High School in Tucson, Arizona where he is also Director of Athletics and Head Football Coach. He is married, has four children.

Edward E. Spence is Principal, Pueblo Junior High School, in Los Alamos, N. M. Born in Liverpool, England, he was raised in the Dakotas, worked for a time in Apple Creek Institution for Feeble Minded in Ohio, taught in several schools in Western Penna., came to Los Alamos in 1947. He has four children. Recreational interests include music and bowling.

Irvin G. Stephens is currently teaching in Goddard High School in Roswell, N. M. Served his military term in Korea and Japan. Graduated from Abilene Christian College where he met his wife. He is the father of three children.

Newsletter Number 4

Mrs. Barbara J. Taylor teaches French, Spanish and Language Arts at Alameda Junior High in Las Cruces. Her husband is working toward a doctorate in chemistry. They enjoy camping, reading, and swimming.

Ernest A. Traylor has served as Principal of several junior and senior high schools in Roswell, N. M. over the years. Currently at Goddard High School, at his request next year he will return to junior high school level at Pueblo Junior High. He is married, has two teen age daughters. His hobbies are golfing and bird watching and he claims he can do both at once!

Arthur B. Trujillo currently is Remedial Reading Supervisor at Zuni High School in Gallup, N. M. A graduate of Highlands University, Mr. Trujillo has worked as editor, reporter and photographer with daily newspapers in New Mexico and Illinois. His wife is also doing graduate work.

Paul David Weisenborn is teaching in Flowing Wells Junior High School in Tucson, Arizona in their Core program, also coaches track and wrestling. He is an enthusiastically active Young Republican. He is married, has a daughter, 7, and a 3 months old son.

Jess C. Williams is currently teaching the 7th grade Fused Program at Court Junior High in Las Cruces. He is a retired USAR, Major, Intelligence and Security. Married, has two children, Tres (Jess, III), 8, and Kellie, 3.

Mrs. Barbara Wooten is Chairman of the English Department in Harrison Junior High School in Colorado Springs, Colorado. She has her BA degree from Texas Western College and MA from University of Arizona. She and her husband spend their spare time driving or hiking the Colorado mountains.

V. INFORMAL PROGRAM

In case some of you were never able to read the brochure announcing our Institute, I'd like to quote the following item:

> "Participants will be charged $75 to cover most of the informal program of the Institute. Other meals can be obtained at the University Food Service at the very reasonable rate of $96 for a 5-day meal ticket or $128 for a 7-day meal ticket."

Part of this $75 charge will be collected on the morning of Monday, June 12, shortly after you have cashed your first stipend check.

Also, will those of you who have not yet sent pictures, please get them to us as quickly as possible.

COPY

Newsletter Number 5 June 14, 1967

SOME ANSWERS - for you and your family's
Exercise, Amusement or Amazement

1. The Fine Arts Department offers, on campus

Creative Art	Mon., Wed., Fri.	9 - 11 am
June 19 - July 14	Register June 16	$12.00 each
July 19 - Aug. 14	Register July 17	session
Private Music Lessons (tba)	One 1/2 hour lesson per week	$12.00
July 12 - July 15	Register now	
July 17 - Aug. 18		

Lessons in piano, violin, trombone, clarinet, flute, trumpet,
See Fine Arts Office Room 100, Music Building

2. The Little Theater Group, on campus

Barefoot in the Park	July 5 - 9,		8:00 pm
or			
Taming of the Shrew	Matinee July 9		2:00 pm
Tom Sawyer	Aug. 4, 5	matinee	2:00 pm
	Aug. 11	matinee	4:00 pm
			8:00 pm
	Aug. 12		10:00 am
			2:00 pm

3. Las Cruces Little Theater Group
at Fountain Theater in Old Mesilla

The Fantasticks	June 30
	July 1, 7, 8, 14, 15, 21, 22

Ann says, "The play is fantastic!"

COPY

Newsletter Number 5

4. Campus Film Society, Chemistry Building, Room 111
   Monday evenings 6 and 8 pm
   A series of films, Series of Six $2.00 or 50¢ per film

   June 19 When Comedy Was King A pot pourri of silent comedy featuring Charlie Chaplin, Laurel and Hardy, etc.

   June 26 The Big Store The Marx Brothers exploit their insane comedy in a department store.

   July 10 Days of Thrills and Laughter Highlights from dozens of Hollywood's funniest comedies and hair-raising thrillers made in days of silents.

   July 24 Bringing Up Baby Sophisticated comedy starring Gary Grant and Katherine Hepburn.

   July 31 Thirty Years of Fun A well edited collection of silent films.

   Aug. 7 Tortilla Flats from Steinbeck's novel, starring Spencer Tracy.

5. The Natatorium offers:
   Swimming Mon. - Fri. 50¢ per person or $2.50 season pass
   Groups, 16 years or older 1 - 5 pm
   Family groups 5 - 9 pm

6. The Student Union
   8 lanes of Bowling 10 am - 10 pm
   25¢ per line, rent shoes 10¢ pair, balls furnished

   Ping Pong, 45¢ an hour 8 am - 10 pm

7. Tennis
   Tennis lessons for children and adults will be given at the tennis courts.

Hope these suggestions help you find some fun!

Myra Kelly